Independent Observer— Volume II

The Mask of the Progressive: Legislative Inaction and the Durability of Terry v. Ohio

Siddhartha Harsh Wardhan (ORCID: 0009-0005-4228-1124)
Affiliation: The Independent Observer
Date: September 05, 2025
JEL: K14, K38, D72, H11 • Keywords: Fourth Amendment, stop-and-frisk, Terry v. Ohio, progressive politics, legislative oversight

Disclosure: None • Rights: © 2025 The author. Working paper distributed for scholarly and educational use.

Abstract

This working paper examines why cornerstone Fourth Amendment doctrines—especially those stemming from Terry v. Ohio (1968)—have proven remarkably durable despite a decade of heightened public attention to policing and civil rights. Drawing on doctrinal analysis, legislative behavior, and policy design, the paper argues that reform efforts have tended to target police training and accountability mechanisms without directly revising the constitutional predicates that authorize stops and frisks. The paper outlines historically significant extensions of Terry, synthesizes scholarship on discretion and disparate impact, and proposes a statutory playbook for narrowing police authority at the federal and state levels without waiting on Supreme Court reversals.

1. Introduction

Many observers assume that electoral shifts or party coalitions labelled “progressive” will produce rapid reversals of policing practices that have drawn sustained criticism. Yet the case law governing everyday encounters between officers and civilians has remained largely intact. This paper reframes the debate, rather than centering on personalities or social media rhetoric, by examining why core Fourth Amendment doctrine persists and what specific legal paths exist to revise it. This manuscript develops and formalizes arguments originally drafted for The Independent Observer as a policy essay about how performative politics coexist with durable search-and-seizure rules.

2. Background: Terry and Its Progeny

In Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968), the Supreme Court authorized brief investigatory stops on “reasonable suspicion,” short of probable cause. The Court also approved protective pat-downs for weapons when an officer reasonably believes the person is armed and poses a danger. Subsequent decisions widened the ambit: Pennsylvania v. Mimms, 434 U.S. 106 (1977), allowed ordering a driver out of a lawfully stopped car; Arizona v. Johnson, 555 U.S. 323 (2009), extended frisk logic to passengers; United States v. Arvizu, 534 U.S. 266 (2002), endorsed a totality-of-circumstances approach

that can aggregate weak factors; and Whren v. United States, 517 U.S. 806 (1996), insulated pretextual traffic stops from Fourth Amendment scrutiny so long as an objective violation exists. Empirically, studies have linked these doctrines to discretionary stop regimes with disparate impacts (e.g., Gelman, Fagan, & Kiss, 2007; Epp, Maynard-Moody, & Haider-Markel, 2014).

3. Why Doctrine Proves Durable

Constitutional Baselines vs. Policy Levers. Courts set constitutional floors, not ceilings. Absent statutory constraints, departments can operate up to the outer edge of Terry and its extensions.

Institutional Inertia and Deference. Appellate courts favor administrable rules and defer to officer experience in fast-moving encounters, reinforcing 'totality' reasoning.

Legislative Targeting Choices. Reforms since 2020 concentrated on qualified immunity, reporting, grants, and pattern-or-practice tools, while leaving Terry's core standards largely intact.

Data, Remedies, and Deterrence. Where statutes require robust stop data and suppression remedies, behavior shifts; where they do not, aggregate discretion persists.

4. Electoral Rhetoric vs. Statutory Design

Public-facing politics often emphasizes values and oversight, but the durability of street-level encounters flows from doctrinal predicates. The relevant question is not which personalities support reform, but which bills concretely alter: (i) the definition of reasonable suspicion; (ii) the permissibility of pretext stops; (iii) the Mimms rule on ordering occupants out of vehicles; and (iv) mandatory exclusionary consequences for non-compliance. Without statutory movement on these predicates, training and oversight alone rarely realign incentives.

5. A Legislative Playbook to Narrow Terry

1. Codify an elevated, enumerated standard for reasonable suspicion, requiring articulable, behavior-based factors and

prohibiting proxies such as race, neighborhood, or generic ‘high-crime area’ labels.

2. Prohibit pretextual stops for non-moving violations (e.g., single broken tail light, hanging air fresheners) and redirect such issues to mail-based compliance notices.

3. Limit Mimms by statute: officers may not order occupants out of a vehicle absent specific, articulable safety risk unrelated to generalized officer-safety assertions.

4. Require contemporaneous, public stop-data reporting (race, age, justification factors, outcomes) with independent auditing and funding conditions for non-compliance.

5. Create a statutory suppression rule and civil remedy tied to violations of the codified standards, with fee-shifting to ensure access to counsel.

6. Incentivize alternatives: expand unarmed traffic units for equipment violations and invest in tele-reporting for minor infractions.

6. Evidence and Comparative Lessons

Natural experiments and city-level reforms suggest that limiting pretext stops can reduce racial disparities while maintaining safety outcomes. Scholarly work documents how routine investigatory contacts drive perceived injustice and downstream legitimacy costs (Epp et al., 2014). Litigation such as Floyd v. City of New York, 959 F. Supp. 2d 540 (S.D.N.Y. 2013), shows that data-rich oversight regimes can surface unconstitutional patterns, but lasting change arrives faster when statutory predicates are tightened.

7. Conclusion

Doctrinal durability is not destiny. Legislatures possess multiple levers to narrow the scope of discretionary stops while increasing transparency and accountability. Reforms that explicitly modify Terry’s operational predicates—and pair them with auditable data and

enforceable remedies—offer a path forward that does not depend on changing the Supreme Court’s composition. The challenge is not a shortage of outrage, but a shortage of statutory specificity.

References

1. Alexander, M. (2010). The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness. The New Press.
2. Berman, A. (2015). Give Us the Ballot: The Modern Struggle for Voting Rights in America. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
3. Epp, C. R., Maynard-Moody, S., & Haider-Markel, D. (2014). Pulled Over: How Police Stops Define Race and Citizenship—University of Chicago Press.
4. Gelman, A., Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (2007). An analysis of the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk policy in the context of claims of racial

bias. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 102(479), 813–823.

5. Harris, D. A. (1997). ‘Driving While Black’ and all other traffic offenses: The Supreme Court and pretext stops. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 87(2), 544–582.
6. Maclin, T. (1990). Terry v. Ohio’s Fourth Amendment legacy: Black men and police discretion. St. John’s Law Review, 72, 1271–1311.
7. Wolin, S. (2008). Democracy Incorporated: Managed Democracy and the Specter of Inverted Totalitarianism. Princeton University Press.
8. Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. Perspectives on Politics, 12(3), 564–581.
9. Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).
10. Pennsylvania v. Mimms, 434 U.S. 106 (1977).
11. Whren v. United States, 517 U.S. 806 (1996).
12. United States v. Arvizu, 534 U.S. 266 (2002).
13. Arizona v. Johnson, 555 U.S. 323 (2009).
14. Floyd v. City of New York, 959 F. Supp. 2d 540 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).
15. Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013).

This is an SSRN-ready working paper formatted for upload; please adapt the affiliations and acknowledgments as needed for submission.